

PROPOSED COUNCIL STUDY ISSUEFor Calendar Year: 2004Continuing ☐New ☐Previous Year (below line/defer) ☒**Issue:** Review of the Miscellaneous Plan Permit Language in the Municipal Code**Lead Department:** Community Development Department**General Plan Element or Sub-Element:** Land Use and Transportation**1. What are the key elements of the issue? What precipitated it?**

This item will review the Miscellaneous Plan Permit (MPP) language in the Municipal Code with particular focus on clarifying the process. The study will examine the current language in the Municipal Code Section 19.82., and determine the areas that may need to be clarified or simplified for better understanding of the process. Specifically, the study will review whether the Municipal Code adequately delineates the process for different types of minor projects.

The intent of the MPP is to streamline the overall Planning permit review process to make it more efficient and effective. The categories of projects that require an MPP are expected to have little impact on the community compared to projects that require a public hearing for a Use Permit or a Special Development Permit. In addition, the types of projects that require an MPP are more numerous than larger projects that require a public hearing. Historically, Staff has processed about 300 MPP applications per year.

The Miscellaneous Plan Permit is a Planning permit that is reviewed and approved at the Staff level typically within 10 working days of its submittal. Minor projects such as fences, signs, landscaping plans and incidental and accessory storage require a MPP. A complete listing of the categories of projects that can be approved with an MPP can be found in SMC Section 19.82.

A similar request was considered by City Council in 2003 (City Council deferred the item). Mayor Miller, the originator of the study, indicated her intent was to clarify the language, not revise the process. Staff has modified this paper to better reflect the intent of the study.

2. How does this relate to the General Plan or existing City Policy?**Legislative Management Sub-Element**

Policy 7.3B.1 Periodically conduct Charter reviews to recommend appropriate changes to the Charter.

3. Origin of issue:

Councilmember: Miller

General Plan: _____

Staff: _____

BOARD or COMMISSION

Arts	<input type="checkbox"/>	Library	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bldg. Code of Appeals	<input type="checkbox"/>	Parks & Rec.	<input type="checkbox"/>
CCAB	<input type="checkbox"/>	Personnel	<input type="checkbox"/>
Heritage & Preservation	<input type="checkbox"/>	Planning	<input type="checkbox"/>
Housing & Human Svcs	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Board / Commission Ranking/Comment:

_____ Board / Commission ranked _____ Of _____

4. Due date for Continuing and Mandatory issues (if known): _____

5. Multiple Year Project? Yes ☐ No ☒ Expected Year of Completion 2004

6. Estimated work hours for completion of the study issue.

(a) Estimated work hours from the lead department 200

(b) Estimated work hours from consultant(s): _____

(c) Estimated work hours from the City Attorney's Office: 40

(d) List any other department(s) and number of work hours:

Department(s): _____

Total Estimated Hours: 240

7. Expected participation involved in the study issue process?

(a) Does Council need to approve a work plan? Yes ☐ No ☒(b) Does this issue require review by a Board/Commission? Yes ☒ No ☐

If so, which Board/Commission? Planning Commission

(c) Is a Council Study Session anticipated? Yes ☐ No ☒

(d) What is the public participation process?

A focus meeting with the public may be held to hear concerns with regard to the MPP language. Standard noticing and advertisements will be a part of this process for both the Planning Commission and City Council public hearings.

8. **Estimated Fiscal Impact:**

Cost of Study	\$	0
Capital Budget Costs	\$	0
New Annual Operating Costs	\$	0
New Revenues or Savings	\$	0
10 Year RAP Total	\$	0

9. **Staff Recommendation**

- ☐ Recommended for Study
☐ Against Study
☒ No Recommendation

Explain below staff's recommendation if "for" or "against" study. Department director should also note the relative importance of this study to other major projects that the department is currently working on or that are soon to begin, and the impact on existing services/priorities.

reviewed by

Department Director

Date

approved by

City Manager

Date